RESPONSE

Claims Status

Claims 1-34 were originally filed in this application. In an Office Action dated July 18, 2005, claims 1-34 were rejected. In response, Applicants filed an Amendment and Response on December 16, 2005, in which claims 1, 28, 11, 17, 18, 24, 27, 29, 33 and 34 were cancelled, claims 3-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 19-23, 25, 26, 28, 30 and 31 were been amended, and claims 35-42 were added. A final Office Action was issued on February 15, 2006, citing new art and rejecting all pending claims. In response, Applicants have amended claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 36 and 42. Support for the amendments can be found at least in the originally filed claims and throughout the application, such as at paragraph [0034]. No new matter has been added.

Information Disclosure Statements

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited in previously submitted Information Disclosure Statements. Included with this response, Applicant submits a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement citing references cited in related cases, and requests that the references included therein be considered prior to any subsequent Office Actions.

Claim Rejections

In the current Action, claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 36 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Claims 3-6, 9, 14-16, 19-22, 25, 30-32 and 35-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,153 to Dujari ("Dujari") in and further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082730 to Capps ("Capps").

Claims 7, 14 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious in light of Dujari and Capps and in further view of Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0135859 to Putterman ("Putterman").

Claims 10 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious in view of Dujari and Capps, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/082730 to Yang et al. ("Yang").

Claims 12 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious in view of Dujari and Capps, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0113946 to Janik ("Janik").

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments submitted above overcome these rejections, and as such the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

In response to rejections listed in section 4.1 of the Office Action, claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 36 and 42 have been amended to particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention, and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claim 35 recites, in part, receiving a content selection, determining if the content is accessible via the device subsystem and, if not, obtaining the content from another source, converting it into a format displayable by the rendering circuit, and providing the content, thereby presenting the received content to the rendering circuit as if from the device subsystem. Likewise, amended independent claim 40 recites, in part, receiving a content selection via the user interface and determining if the content is accessible and if not, obtaining the content from another source, converting the content into a format displayable by the rendering circuit, and rendering it as though read from the device subsystem.

Dujari does not teach or suggest a system that, upon locating a selected media element, converts the media element into a format recognizable by a rendering circuit and presents the media element to the rendering circuit as if the media element were stored on the device itself, as recited in Applicants' claim 35. Rather, Dujari is generally directed to a method of accelerating delivery of content to an Internet browser by caching some of the content locally. Abstract and col. 1 line 66 – col. 2 line 24. Unlike the present claims, which recite an emulation circuit that

converts content not found on a device to a format displayable by the device's rendering circuit as if the content were on the device itself, Dujari relies on pre-existing compatibility between the content and a device's rendering capability. In particular, Dujari describes no more than cache-management functionality — not conversion or emulation capability. In the Dujari system, *the application itself* must look for requested content, and it must find that content in a format that can be rendered directly without the aid of intermediate emulation, such as claimed by Applicants.

In fact, there are three conditions that must be met before the Dujari system can fully function: (1) the content must have been previously requested, and (2) the content must be cached on the local drive, and (3) information describing the content (i.e., the URL) must be registered as a mapping of URL patterns to cache prefix information (e.g., a file location and name moniker) such that the network application can locate the content when requested. Dujari, col. 5 lines 46-48 and 53-59, and col. 8 lines 43-46. Furthermore, if the content is to be retrieved from a remote location, the network application merely *locates* the file, and does so "in its usual manner," suggesting that no format conversion takes place. Dujari, col. 8 lines 43-46. In either case (remote or local retrieval), the network application simply determines the location of the content and retrieves it, thus implying that the content is retrieved in a format recognizable by the application.

In contrast to Dujari, Applicants' claimed invention includes emulation capabilities that allow an audio/visual system to locate, retrieve and display content regardless of source or format by providing an emulation circuit that locates and presents the content as if retrieved from the system itself.

Capps also does not describe the use of an emulation circuit acting as a proxy for an audio/visual device, such that media elements can be displayed as if retrieved from the device even if they actually originate elsewhere. Instead, the universal media player described by Capps decodes the MIME type associated with a media element and subsequently determines if the element is in a format recognized by the player. If not, the media player relinquishes control of the element and allows it to be played using another player that must be downloaded from a server. Para. [0042]. Thus, unlike Applicants' system that emulates other media sources by converting remotely supplied media content such that it is presented to a display as if residing on

the device itself, Capps relies on external decoders and players to display unsupported media types.

Putterman does not cure the deficiencies of Dujari or Capps. Putterman is generally directed to a system for distributing media among various clients within a home media network that includes various devices such as "a personal computer (PC), an acquisition/storage set-top box, control/-playback set-top boxes, a digital interface and a personal digital assistant (PDA) all coupled via a data transmission medium." Para. [0029]. To facilitate ordering, control and playback of media at the various devices, "[d]igital data content objects are transmitted from one device within the home network to the other devices via transmission medium." Para. [0030]. Putterman does not, however, teach or suggest using an emulation circuit in one device to locate a desired media element on other devices, nor does Putterman contemplate providing the element to a display as if the element were resident on the device itself, as claimed.

Similar to Putterman, Janik relies on user-specified instructions including the location of the desired media element. Janik is generally directed to a system that facilitates the playback of digital content stored on a PC on existing audio equipment. Para. [0011]. The system described by Janik includes a PC to "acquire, store, manage and serve digital audio content" and a digital audio converter that "is connected to a conventional stereo receiver via the right and left RCA jack inputs." Paras. [0046] and [0047]. The digital audio converter receives digital audio streams sent from the PC, decodes and decompresses the digital audio in real time, and converts it from a digital format into a analog electrical signal. Para. [0050]. Janik's system does not include an emulation circuit in the device itself that can locate a desired media element regardless of location, and provide the element to a display as if the element were resident on the device itself, as claimed.

Finally, Yang does not remedy the deficiencies of Dujari and Capps described above. Yang is generally directed to a system that delivers requested multimedia content using an abstract content model and an optimal content delivery plan based on the content model. The content model uses various attributes of the requested content and characteristics of the network on which the content is to be delivered to determine the best-fit delivery plan. Para. [0039].

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 35 and 40, as well as those claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the application and claims in light of this Amendment and Response, and submit that all currently pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, in his review of this Amendment and Response or after further examination, that a telephonic interview would expedite the favorable prosecution of the present application, the Applicants' attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues, and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 6, 2006
Reg. No. 56,401

Joel E. Lehrer
Attorney for Applicants
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Customer No. 051414

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1057
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231